

DELTA STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL
DELTA PLAN INTERAGENCY IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

November 5, 2018

Tsakopoulos Library Galleria

828 I St, Sacramento

MEETING SUMMARY

The Delta Stewardship Council (Council) established the Delta Plan Interagency Implementation Committee (Committee) after adoption of the Delta Plan in 2013 and continues to coordinate and oversee Committee activities as required by the Delta Reform Act. The Committee serves as a forum to discuss, consider, and orchestrate the timely and orderly implementation of the Delta Plan and Delta Science Plan as well as a venue to coordinate on priorities and best management practices intended to improve statewide water supply reliability and ecosystem conditions in the Delta. The tenth Committee meeting took place on Monday, November 5, 2018 and was called to order by Chair Randy Fiorini.

Attendees

The following were in attendance (alphabetical):

Federico Barajas, Deputy Regional Director, Mid-Pacific Region, US Reclamation (Reclamation), representing the Department of the Interior (DOI)

John Callaway, Lead Scientist, Delta Science Program

Mike Chotkowski, Science Coordinator, Pacific Region, US Geological Survey (USGS) *(for Mark Sogge, Regional Director for the Pacific Region)*

Randy Fiorini, Chair, Council and Committee

Campbell Ingram, Executive Officer, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy (Conservancy)

Mario Manzo, Bay Delta Office Deputy Manager, Reclamation *(for Mr. Barajas)*

Felicia Marcus, Chair, State Water Resources Control Board (Water Board)

Clyde McDonald, Board Member, Central Valley Flood Protection Board (Flood Board) *(for Bill Edgar, President)*

Cindy Messer, Chief Deputy Director, Department of Water Resources (DWR) *(for Karla Nemeth, Director)*

Kristen Peer, Assistant General Counsel, California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) *(for Matt Rodriguez, Secretary)*

Karen Ross, Secretary, California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)

Paul Souza, Regional Director, Fish & Aquatic Conservation, US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

Cindy Tejada, Watershed and Floodplain Program Manager, South Pacific Division, US Army Corps of Engineers (US ACE) *(for Josephine Axt, Chief of Planning, South Pacific Division)*

Barry Thom, West Coast Regional Administrator, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries, West Coast Region

Skip Thompson, Chair, Delta Protection Commission (DPC)

Tomas Torres, Water Division Director, US Environmental Protection Agency Region 9 (US EPA)

Carl Wilcox, Policy Advisor to the Director for the Delta, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) *(for Chuck Bonham, Director)*

In addition to those listed above, various experts and managers presented to the Committee (in order of appearance):

Ryan Stanbra, Legislative and Policy Advisor, Council

Delta Plan Interagency Implementation Committee, Meeting Summary (November 5, 2018)

Chad Gorman, Assistant Director, Natural Resources and Environment, United States Government Accountability Office (GAO)

Susan Iott, Assistant Director, Natural Resources and Environment, GAO

Ron Melcer, Senior Environmental Scientist (Spec), Council

Charlotte Biggs, Program Manager, DWR

Erika Lovejoy, Program Director, Sustainable Conservation (SusCon)

Larry Goldzband, Executive Director, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)

Yumiko Henneberry, Senior Environmental Scientist (Spec), Council

Edward Hard, Aquatic Invasive Species, California State Parks, Division of Boating and Waterways

Michelle Dennis, Environmental Program Manager I, CDFA

Martha Volkoff, Senior Environmental Scientist, DFW

Overview and Introductions

Chair Fiorini welcomed Committee members and attendees to the 10th Committee meeting and asked the Committee members to introduce themselves.

Chair Fiorini invited Mr. Souza to say a few words. Mr. Souza informed the Committee of Steve Thompson's passing and noted Mr. Thompson's successful career at USFWS and in conservation. The Committee took a moment of silence in honor of Mr. Thompson.

Chair Fiorini provided an overview of the day's meeting.

Furthering the Federal/State Nexus – The Bay-Delta Watershed and the Role for DPIIC

Chair Fiorini welcomed the panelists and introduced Mr. Stanbra. Mr. Stanbra noted the challenges in reporting and managing water in an environment that is inherently complex. The institutional landscape of the Delta houses approximately 200 public entities with various jurisdictions and roles, which underscores the critical importance of collaborative efforts like the Committee, as well as the need to assess the impact these efforts have on decision-making in the region. The GAO recently released, *"San Francisco Bay Delta Watershed, Wide Range of Restoration Efforts Need Updated Federal Reporting and Coordination Roles"* which looks at the federal government's role in restoration efforts throughout the Bay-Delta watershed. Mr. Stanbra introduced Mr. Gorman and Ms. Iott from the GAO.

Mr. Gorman provided an overview of the report's purpose, findings, and recommendations. A bi-partisan request from the Chair and a ranking member of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure initiated the report. The request was for the GAO to provide an overview of restoration efforts in the Bay-Delta watershed. The report focused on four objectives: how federal and non-federal entities coordinate restoration efforts; how they developed measurable goals to track progress; information and status of expenditure since 2007; and key factors that limit restoration according to federal and non-federal entities.

The report had several findings, namely that the 2009 Interim Federal Action Plan is no longer being utilized by federal agencies but that the Committee acts as the coordinating body for federal and State entities in the Delta.

Delta Plan Interagency Implementation Committee, Meeting Summary (November 5, 2018)

The report's primary recommendation was for the DOI and the Council on Environmental Quality to update or revise the Interim Federal Action Plan and that DOI and the Office of Management and Budget coordinate with the state of California to meet the CalFed Act's reporting requirements.

Ms. Iott provided a summary of how Bay-Delta efforts compare to ecosystem restoration work across the country. Similar systems are multi-jurisdictional and involve many of the same types of projects; some systems have one organizing group; and many have strategic plans and science plans.

Mr. Souza asked if a strengths or weaknesses evaluation could be offered for the Bay-Delta vs other systems. Ms. Iott noted the formation of a group, such as the Committee as an important step. A science plan is also essential, as is committed people, and a willingness to collaborate.

Ms. Marcus acknowledged that the federal and State roles can see-saw and that there is value in having an institution that pulls the State and federal families together. Ms. Marcus noted that the report addressed complex amounts of information and highlighted examples of projects, such as the Science Enterprise Workshop, that she found valuable and inspiring. Ms. Marcus expressed interest in knowing about communication efforts in other systems, as well as differences in the federal role.

Ms. Iott acknowledged that the relationship between the federal and State agencies do switch and pointed out that there are different structures, but almost all have strong State leadership. Federal agencies generally play a role, as needed, depending on the problems faced, which agencies are involved, and who is leading efforts. In regards to communication, Ms. Iott spoke on the importance of having a strategic plan and indicators; indicators help communicate and drive the work and get everyone onto the same page.

Mr. Thom stated that it could be valuable, across all the agencies and systems, to do a lessons learned report. He spoke of the challenges related to a potential watershed-wide focus noting different concerns in different parts of the watershed. Mr. Thom asked if there is consistency when reporting outcomes or performance across some of those different ecosystem efforts, and how it looks across the different ecosystems in terms of actual outcomes achieved.

Ms. Iott noted that there are no plans for a multi-system review. She stated, however, that there is talk about compiling lessons learned.

Mr. Wilcox asked if they have any guidance or suggestions about how to approach performance measures.

Mr. Gorman noted that for this particular review, they did not specifically look at the effectiveness of performance measures, but rather at the extent that they existed and where there were approaches to report on those particular measures.

Mr. Calloway asked if there are any good examples of how performance measures have been used in a system across an entire watershed.

Delta Plan Interagency Implementation Committee, Meeting Summary (November 5, 2018)

Ms. Iott stated that the Great Lakes are still trying to work on a broad set of indicators and the Everglades are the furthest along regarding indicators across an ecosystem.

Chair Fiorini noted his gratification with federal agency interaction, on both the Committee and the workgroups; especially since federal agencies are here by choice, not by regulation.

Mr. Barajas noted that of the seven recommendations in the report, three of those were directly related to the DOI. There is benefit in what has transpired over the years with the Committee and looking forward, this body is the place where they need to be investing resources and coordination.

Mr. Ingram suggested building time into future Committee agendas, to look at the upper watershed and the bay, as well as think about opportunities to coordinate connectivity efforts and highlight opportunities to work together.

Mr. Wilcox noted opportunities to pull everything together using collaborative science, adaptive management, and developing specific plans that can present a clear picture of what the science program is for a particular topic and how that integrates with other science plans.

Future Delta 2050-2100 – Progress toward Restoration and Recovery

Mr. Melcer introduced himself and reminded the Committee members of the initiation of an amendment to chapter four of the Delta Plan. Council staff has conducted public meetings, workshops, Council presentations, and targeted briefings with State, federal, local government partners, landowners, and stakeholders. Staff has focused on updating their understanding of the existing conditions in the Delta, including exercises to further understand sea level rise, subsidence, and the human related aspects of the Delta.

The amendment will provide more active guidance via coordination, alignment, planning, and implementation in order to achieve the outcomes described in the Delta Reform Act and support the vision that the 2013 Delta Plan provided. This will include identification of priority restoration actions and conservation targets focused on ecosystem uplift; thinking about short term and long-term timeframes; and developing guidance that is at the right level of detail both in the policies, recommendations, and performance measures.

The intent is to provide an amendment that capitalizes on existing alignment around the Delta with relation to conservation and to resolve institutional challenges with the momentum that has been created through the leadership of current conservation initiatives, such as EcoRestore.

Ms. Messer thanked Mr. Melcer and Jessica Law, chief deputy executive officer for the Council, for actively engaging in these efforts with DWR.

Mr. Souza asked Mr. Melcer if he could give the Committee a better sense of the public aspects of the amendment process.

Mr. Melcer noted the public meeting in the Delta, several workshops at Council meetings, and the plan to continue to present regularly at Council meetings. There has been a lot of organic and targeted engagement with various stakeholders and agencies. Moving forward, they will continue to work with the

Delta Plan Interagency Implementation Committee, Meeting Summary (November 5, 2018)

Council during council meetings and with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) public engagement requirements. There is also a standing invitation for comment letters on the synthesis work.

Mr. Melcer noted that he is developing content that identifies priority actions on the landscape and analyzes areas where these actions might occur. They are thinking more broadly about how to engage and develop partnerships and how to expand on the funding available for activities.

Ms. Marcus thanked Mr. Melcer and complimented the Council on its leadership, noting the responsibility and opportunity to develop an innovative restoration vision.

Mr. Chotkowski thanked Mr. Melcer for the update and asked if there is a Venn diagram somewhere that shows the relationships among restoration goals and objectives for the lower estuary, noting that it would be interesting to see a diagram that actually shows what the goals and objectives are, where they are, and how they are aligned.

Mr. Melcer responded by noting that they are trying to develop a common language for performance measures and data so that they can start to understand actions everywhere.

Chair Fiorini encouraged each of the agencies to continue to engage with Mr. Melcer and his team and that between now and the next DPIIC meeting in April, there will be a draft, recommendations, and performance measures for review and input.

Mr. Fiorini invited Ms. Biggs to the table to present an update on California EcoRestore. Ms. Biggs stated that she was there on behalf of Mike Roberts, who is the special assistant for Delta restoration with the California Natural Resources Agency and the head of California EcoRestore.

Ms. Biggs provided an overview of EcoRestore and the 29 different projects: 6 fish passage improvement projects, 3 floodplain restoration projects, 3 setback levee projects, 5 subsidence reversal and carbon storage projects, and 13 restoration projects. Ms. Biggs also mentioned the launch of a public outreach campaign this year to educate stakeholders in efforts to date.

Ms. Biggs mentioned some of the institutional challenges they've identified and potential solutions that are being discussed:

- Developing more dynamic contracting and land acquisition processes;
- Increasing collaboration between project proponents and regulatory agencies;
- Working with public agencies and non-profit partners to make project permitting more efficient; and
- Planning for long-term property and operations and management (O&M) on restoration sites.

Ms. Biggs also noted the implementation of resiliency strategies undertaken in 2018: North Delta Flow Pulse, Construction of Western Outflow (Roaring River), and Salinity Gate Reoperation.

Ms. Ross offered that CDFA has the same issues with O&M and asked how the CNRA is calculating O&M needs.

Delta Plan Interagency Implementation Committee, Meeting Summary (November 5, 2018)

Ms. Biggs explained that the process is very complicated and is based on a lot of estimation. They are looking at what projects they had, putting their estimates together based on different multipliers, and assessing what else is needed.

Mr. Ingram thanked Ms. Biggs and complimented EcoRestore's impressive progress. Mr. Ingram suggested the development of a collective Delta restoration message in order to maintain a high level of support moving into a new administration.

Mr. Souza applauded EcoRestore for a couple of great years and the State of California for its leadership and ability to provide funding. Mr. Souza asked Ms. Biggs to share a little bit about the monitoring efforts underway and whether or not there were examples of the federal government coming to the table and covering these costs, noting that he was not aware of the issues surrounding O&M. Ms. Biggs was not aware of examples where the federal government helped with O&M, but said she would look into it. Regarding the monitoring question, especially for the projects related to the State Water Project (SWP) and the Central Valley Project, a robust monitoring plan is being developed. In addition, Ms. Biggs mentioned that even on projects that are not SWP funded, such as Dutch Slough, they have monitoring and adaptive management plans.

Mr. Souza asked if there had been a conversation about trying to bring delta smelt monitoring into play in order to find evidence of fish using the restored habitat.

Mr. Wilcox explained that the fish and wetland monitoring programs have been underway for the last couple of years and that they coordinate their sampling to build a robust understanding of how these projects function, particularly in relationship to other existing wetlands.

Chair Fiorini commented that there needs to be more conversations and discussion before the next meeting, or perhaps an interim workgroup.

Chair Fiorini invited Ms. Lovejoy and Mr. Goldzband to the presenters' table to discuss multi-agency permitting.

Mr. Ingram introduced Ms. Lovejoy and Mr. Goldzband and reminded the Committee of the collective challenges around permitting restoration projects.

Ms. Lovejoy outlined the permitting initiative coordinated by SusCon and the engagement of the US ACOE, NOAA Restoration Center, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), USFWS, and the Water Board. These four agencies have interrelated permitting processes; SusCon is working with them to help develop coordinated programmatic authorizations for a variety of common restoration project types throughout the State. Additionally, DWR, CNRA, California State Parks, the Council, and the Coastal Conservancy are funding this effort. By using a programmatic approach, they were able to write authorizations in advance to cover the highest priority projects, specific conditions, and agency expectations upfront, creating more regulatory certainty and helping to protect resources. The goal with this initiative is to have the authorizations in place by the end of 2020.

Ms. Lovejoy noted that they have completed programmatic coverage for section seven of the Endangered Species Act; secured final letters of support; and established dedicated teams at all of the USFWS field offices and regional water boards.

Delta Plan Interagency Implementation Committee, Meeting Summary (November 5, 2018)

In 2019, the project will focus on drafting the USFWS Biological Assessment; and draft Water Board permit and CEQA documents.

Mr. Goldzband provided an overview of efforts in the Bay. The impetus for their approach was an approved ballot measure imposing a \$12 per parcel property tax to be used in the Bay for habitat restoration. The purpose of the effort is to remove unnecessary and costly delays to multi-benefit wetland restoration projects. Called the Bay Restoration Regulatory Integration Team (BRRIT), the effort has dedicated regulatory agency staff who meet 2-3 days each week. The staff coordinates pre-application meetings with the project sponsors and review of the project information. Staff visits the sites as a team, holds quarterly public meetings, and identifies and elevates difficult issues that need to be addressed by the Policy and Management Team (PMT).

The PMT was created to review permitting issues raised by BRRIT that require policy shifts or upper management involvement; resolve long-standing “sand in the gears” policy issues faced by regulatory agencies; and manage and execute inter-agency agreements and billing for BRRIT staff.

Mr. Souza thanked Mr. Goldzband and Ms. Lovejoy for their efforts and presentations. Mr. Souza noted that he uses the word “partner” on purpose because he intends to be a full partner in this effort and noted the benefit of hiring someone specifically for this project.

Mr. Thom highlighted the significant staff savings resulting from this effort and asked if there was any overlap between the Delta and the Bay’s efforts. Ms. Lovejoy responded that there is not currently overlap, but following the programmatic authorizations in the Delta, a regulatory team approach could be a real benefit. There would be opportunity to utilize these programmatic processes that are in place and when there are projects that occur that do not fit under the scope of the programmatic authorizations, they would have more time to work on the more complex projects.

Ms. Marcus praised the efforts and noted that the work is inspiring. She explained that it has been wonderful to see the effort pulled together in the Bay and articulated so well in a community that has more local governments than anywhere of comparable size. She called it “low-glamor-high-value work” and thanked both presenters.

Mr. Wilcox was encouraged to see the BRRIT and PMT come together. The effort gets to the core of the issues and are critical factors to make things happen in a timely way.

Mr. Barajas asked if there is an element of environmental compliance to these initiatives. Mr. Goldzband responded that this is post-CEQA.

Chair Fiorini thanked the presenters and recessed the meeting for 15 minutes.

One Delta, One Science – Advancing Collaborative Science

Mr. Calloway presented an update on Delta Science Program activities. The Bay-Delta Science Conference occurred in early September with over 1000 attendees and 400 presentations and a first day plenary that focused on social science and science communication issues.

Mr. Calloway updated the Committee on the Delta Science Proposal Solicitation. He noted the importance of the effort as a major component of *One Delta, One Science*. Mr. Calloway thanked Rebecca

Delta Plan Interagency Implementation Committee, Meeting Summary (November 5, 2018)

Fris from DFW, Dylan Stern from the Delta Science Program, and Josh Israel from Reclamation on their efforts to make the Delta Science Proposal Solicitation successful.

The funding priorities were driven by the Science Action Agenda. Sixty-two proposals were submitted for a total request of \$43,000,000. Decisions, following review, will be made in March or April.

Mr. Calloway invited Ms. Henneberry to provide an overview of the updated Delta Science Plan. The Delta Science Plan contributes to achieving the vision of *One Delta, One Science*, providing vision and strategy.

The updated Delta Science Plan integrates Social Science into the Delta Science Plan and provides greater focus on climate change.

The Delta Agency Science Workgroup met multiple times to provide input to the updated plan. And in April, staff coordinated a public workshop to further engage the Delta science community; 7 new actions were added to the Delta Science Plan as a result of the workshop. In addition, there were also discussions on how the community could utilize the Delta Science Plan in the future, where the current document needed more clarity, and an in-depth dialogue on the different chapter topics.

Additional actions included those capitalizing on existing groups to strengthen policy-science interactions; encourage synthesis and data analysis to support useful information for managers; and identify the need for resources to conduct these efforts.

The draft updated Delta Science Plan is currently undergoing a review by the Delta Independent Science Board.

Mr. Souza expressed his approval of the draft update and expressed his belief that the plan will facilitate movement forward. Mr. Souza hoped that this work would help agencies make proper science investments and stated that there would be continued value for us to keep working hard on linking these different science efforts.

Mr. Thom requested a meeting between the Delta Science Program and the fishery science center to make sure that all efforts are aligned.

Mr. Wilcox stated that this is a good step in the evolution of the science plan and suggested that more can be done especially in terms of conducting synthesis and digesting it down to the point that policy makers find it accessible.

Mr. Calloway thanked Mr. Wilcox and noted that an earlier comment of his, regarding more specific science plans, generated one of the new action areas included in the updated Delta Science Plan.

Mr. Calloway requested an endorsement in concept for the updated Delta Science Plan. Chair Fiorini asked if there was any dissent amongst the Committee members; there was none.

Chair Fiorini introduced the Delta science funding initiative—comprised of approximately 20 State and federal agency leaders and stakeholders all working toward making better funding decisions in support of science.

Delta Plan Interagency Implementation Committee, Meeting Summary (November 5, 2018)

Two parallel paths have emerged from the effort; one, evaluating efficiencies of how money is being spent; and two, determining how they can better secure long term sustainable and reliable funding for the kinds of activities that decision support science requires. More will come at the next Committee meeting.

Aquatic Weeds and Nutria Update

Chair Fiorini invited Edward Hard, Michelle Dennis, and Martha Volkoff to the presenters table to discuss aquatic weeds and nutria.

Mr. Hard introduced the role of the DBW, as the lead agency in the Delta charged with coordinating the identification, detection, control, and administration of programs to manage invasive aquatic plants as defined in statute. The overall approach for the program is to control these plants for three critical reasons: economy, public health, and the environment. Coordination is conducted through a federal partner (US Department of Agriculture) who helps navigate section seven of the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. Hard noted that they are not an eradication program; they control when they find new species and that they use four methods for control: herbicide, mechanical harvesting, biological controls, and physical controls.

Historically, the program has not been science-oriented, but with sustained support they have been able to stop and think about what they are doing, how it is working, and can practice adaptive management. The program is being proactive versus reactive and focusing on performance metrics.

Ms. Dennis introduced herself and provided context on her work regarding integrated pest control at CDFA. In the past, the integrated pest control branch lost 100 percent of its general funds for all programs and had to cut many programs. The Hydrilla eradication program, however, was retained, chiefly because Hydrilla is one weed that could change the Delta irrevocably.

Although Hydrilla has never been found in the Delta, it has been found in California. Hydrilla was first detected in California in 1976 in Lake Ellis in Yuba County. In 1977, the California Legislature declared that “the eradication of this aquatic weed pest is essential to the preservation of the environment.”

Infestations have varied from small private ponds, canals, rivers and large lake systems. Since the inception of the program, CDFA has eradicated 60 of these infestations. In 2018, there were 20 active treatment sites in three counties. Active counties include; Lake, Nevada, and Yuba. Past infested counties include; Calaveras, Imperial, Los Angeles, Madera, Mariposa, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Francisco, San Diego, Santa Barbra, Shasta, Sonoma, Sutter, and Tulare.

Mr. Ingram asked if climate change and increasing temperatures will increase the risk of Hydrilla moving into the Delta. Ms. Dennis responded that is it difficult to say, but Hydrilla is always a risk.

Ms. Volkoff presented an overview of the current nutria situation in California and the Delta. In California, 325 nutria have been trapped or otherwise captured. DFW is leading the eradication effort. DFW has been working since 2017 to line up funding to cover their efforts. Currently, they have a small crew in the field and they have been working closely with the county agricultural commissioners on outreach, as well giving presentations at a variety of forums throughout the State.

Delta Plan Interagency Implementation Committee, Meeting Summary (November 5, 2018)

Based on calculations and modeling, DFW finds itself far off the eradication curve. For eradication to be successful, they must capture more animals than are reproducing, which they do not think they are currently doing.

Chair Fiorini thanked Ms. Volkoff and echoed her concern about urgency. He thanked DFW for their work and highlighted the need for more resources. Chair Fiorini charged the Committee to identify a high level person, appropriate for this matter, to meet in a workgroup by the next DPIIC meeting.

Ms. Messer thanked the presenters and commended them on their work, and expressed approval of the advisory group.

Mr. McDonald made a comment on the importance of knowing how many animals are out there, what their reproductive rate is, how many they were catching, and the cost of the damage to date.

Mr. Thompson echoed his concern about nutria and added that coordination and cooperation of the land owners is needed. He strongly encouraged the committee members to go back to their agencies and talk about what it is they could do to bridge communication gaps.

Mr. Callaway gave his appreciation for the comments on rapid response. He provided two contrasting scenarios regarding nutria issues and drew a comparison between eradication vs. control. He believes the sooner we attack, the less the cost will be.

Mr. Souza agreed with Mr. Callaway. The effort has been terrific so far, but clearly they are falling behind. He restated that rapid response is key to having any hope of eradication and that he was very supportive of the proposal.

Mr. Ingram thanked the panel and expressed willingness to participate in the workgroup. He also noted that the Conservancy has already awarded 2 million dollars to the program and has a 3 million dollar request under review.

Chair Fiorini asked if there was any dissent to the formation of the work group. He did not receive any dissent from the Committee and charged Amanda Bohl, special assistant for planning and science at the Council, with working with DFW in the convening and specific charge of the workgroup.

The Chair asked if there was public comment.

Jason Peltier thanked Mr. Souza for his comment on Steve Thompson and commended Chair Fiorini for his leadership. In addition, Mr. Peltier noted that the nutria problem was truly an emergency, and that the actions taken in this meeting will help with control and eradication—especially with buy-in from upper management.

Committee Business

Chair Fiorini asked Committee members to provide final comments, including the value of the Committee and suggestions for strengthening the collaboration.

Delta Plan Interagency Implementation Committee, Meeting Summary (November 5, 2018)

Mr. Thompson noted that he will not be returning. He thanked everyone for the knowledge they bring to the table and acknowledged that they helped him to be a better policy-maker.

Mr. Souza reminded everyone not to forget their collective successes, as evidenced by this year's successful salmon run. He also noted that the focus on State efforts, albeit important, does not always include federal recognition and hopes that the Committee can find ways to integrate the work that is being done between the federal and State governments.

Mr. McDonald believes that in order for their work to be carried forward, the audience has to care about it. Public access to certain areas will provide that understanding and eventually lead to change, especially when it comes time for decisions concerning the well-being and proper funding of the Delta.

Ms. Marcus expressed her continued support for the Committee; it is worthwhile and it is important to convey the action and efforts going on in the Delta. Ms. Marcus also noted that Chair Fiorini will be missed.

Chair Fiorini thanked Ms. Marcus and charged everyone who will remain to continue the work and to care and feed this effort. He commented on the frequency of the meetings, suggesting it might be time to consider meeting more often.

Mr. Fiorini also stated that it has been a privilege to serve and that he could not have done it alone. Mr. Fiorini thanked the Committee coordinators: Taryn Ravazinni, Ms. Law, and Ms. Bohl.

Mr. Fiorini thanked everyone for attending and adjourned the meeting in Steve Thompson's memory.

The webcast for the meeting can be found here: <http://cal-span.org/unipage/?site=cal-span&owner=DSC&date=2018-11-05>.

Next Meeting: April 8, 2019, at the Tsakopoulos Library Galleria, 828 I Street, Sacramento, CA.